

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 2, 2005. Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 14 are in the application, of which Claims 1 and 7 to 12 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,701,378 (Gilhuly) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757 (Multer). Claims 2 to 4 and 6 to 14 were rejected under § 103(a) over Gilhuly in view of Multer and U.S. Patent No. 6,587,831 (O'Brien). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

### Independent Claims 1, 8, 10 and 12

The invention of independent Claims 1, 8, 10 and 12 generally concerns communication with user terminal devices and managing status information of users. Schedule information of registered users is searched and the presence or absence of a user at one of the user terminal devices is obtained. Among its many features, the invention of Claims 1, 8, 10 and 12 includes (i) determining whether last status information of a user's action is to be extended or not in accordance with both the presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information, and (ii) generating change information based on the result of the determination.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a status information sharing system for managing status information of users who operate user terminal devices. The system includes a recognition unit that recognizes a presence or absence of a user at one of the user terminal devices, a search unit that

searches schedule information of registered users, a determination unit that determines whether last status information of the user's action is to be extended or not, in accordance with both the recognition of the presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information, a generation unit that generates change information based on the result of the determination unit, and an update unit that updates status information of the user's action on the basis of the generated change information.

Independent Claim 8 as amended is directed to a server device for communicating with user terminal devices. The device includes an obtaining unit that obtains a presence or absence of a user from one of the user terminal devices, a search unit that searches schedule information of registered users, a determination unit that determines whether last status information of the user's action is to be extended or not, in accordance with both the presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information, a generation unit that generates change information based on the result of the determination unit, and an update unit that updates the status information of the user's action on the basis of the generated change information.

Independent Claims 10 and 12 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, substantially corresponding to the device of Claim 8.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the invention of independent Claims 1, 8, 10 and 12, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of (i) determining whether last status information of a user's action is to be extended or not in accordance with both the presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information, and (ii) generating change information based on the result of the determination.

As understood by Applicants, Gilhuly discloses a method for redirecting user-selected data items from a host system to a mobile data communication device upon sensing a triggering event. The redirector program operates in connection with event-generating applications and repackaging systems at the host system to configure and detect a particular user-defined event, and then to repackage the user-selected items in an electronic wrapper prior to pushing the data items to the mobile device. (See Gilhuly, Abstract).

The Office Action asserts on page 3 that Gilhuly (Column 5, lines 44 to 60, Column 6, lines 6 to 7, and Column 10, lines 35 to 48) discloses a generation unit that generates updated status information in accordance with both the recognition of a presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information.

However, Gilhuly is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of (i) determining whether last status information of a user's action is to be extended or not in accordance with both the presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information, and (ii) generating change information based on the result of the determination.

In particular, the portions of Gilhuly cited by the Office Action merely describe data items, such as email messages and calendar events, that may be pushed to the mobile communication device upon detection of a trigger, such as sensing that the user is no longer in the vicinity of the host system or activation of the screen saver after a period of inactivity. (See Gilhuly, Column 5, lines 44 to 60, Column 6, lines 6 to 7, and Column 10, lines 35 to 48). Nowhere is Gilhuly seen to disclose or suggest determining whether last status information of a of a user's action is to be extended, as Gilhuly is only seen to be

concerned with redirecting current information to the mobile device upon a trigger event. In fact, Gilhuly states that the general problem in the art is the failure to get current information to mobile devices. (See Gilhuly, Column 1, lines 53 to 60).

Moreover, Gilhuly is not seen to disclose status information of a user's action at all, much less determining whether last status information of a user's action is to be extended or not. In Gilhuly, the data items sent to the user's mobile device may be somehow related to the user, such as e-mails or address or journal entries, but these are not seen to be status information of the user's action, and are simply items redirected to the device upon reception by the host system. (See Gilhuly, Column 5, lines 44 to 57). Moreover, while the system of Gilhuly may maintain "user profile" information, this information is seen to be related to configuration and preferences for the user's desktop system or mobile device, rather than anything related to the status of a user's action. (See Gilhuly, Column 8, lines 24 to 31 and Column 16, lines 11 to 46).

As Gilhuly fails to disclose or suggest determining whether last status information of a user's action is to be extended or not in accordance with both the presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information, Gilhuly clearly cannot disclose the additional feature of generating change information based on that determination.

Multer is not seen to remedy the shortcomings of Gilhuly. As understood by Applicants, Multer discloses a system for synchronizing devices coupled to a network. The system includes a first sync engine on a first system which interfaces with data thereon to provide difference information to a data store, and a second sync engine on a second

system which receives the difference information from the data store and updates its data with the difference information. (See Multer, Abstract).

However, nowhere is Multer seen to disclose or suggest (i) determining whether last status information of a user's action is to be extended or not in accordance with both the presence or absence of the user and the searched schedule information, and (ii) generating change information based on the result of the determination.

O'Brien has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Gilhuly and Multer.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 8, 10 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request same.

#### Independent Claims 7, 9 and 11

Claims 7, 9 and 11 are directed to the terminal side of the present invention and generally concern communicating with a server device for managing schedules of users who operate user terminal devices. Information representing the presence or absence of a user at a user terminal is transmitted to the server device. Among its many features, the invention of Claims 7, 9 and 11 includes receiving last status information of the user's action which is extended or not extended based on a determination in accordance with both information representing the presence or absence of the user at the user terminal and schedule information managed by the server device.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 9 as amended is directed to a control method for controlling a user terminal device for communicating with a server device for managing schedules of users who operate user terminal devices.

The method includes a generation step of generating information representing a presence or absence of a user at the user terminal device based on information from a recognition unit, a transmission step of transmitting the generated information representing the presence or absence of the user at the user terminal device to the server device, and a receiving step of receiving last status information of the user's action which is extended or not extended based on a determination in accordance with both the transmitted information and schedule information managed by the server device.

Independent Claims 7 and 11 are device and storage medium claims, respectively, substantially corresponding to the method of Claim 9.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the invention of independent Claims 7, 9 and 11, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of receiving last status information of the user's action which is extended or not extended based on a determination in accordance with both information representing the presence or absence of the user at the user terminal and schedule information managed by the server device.

In particular, as noted above, Gilhuly, Multer, and O'Brien fail to disclose determining whether last status information of a user's action is to be extended or not. As such, they also are not seen to disclose or suggest receiving last status information of the user's action which is extended or not extended based on a determination in accordance with both information representing the presence or absence of the user at the user terminal and schedule information managed by the server device.

Accordingly, Claims 7, 9 and 11 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request same.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 109472v1